

**CALIFORNIA MARINE LIFE PROTECTION ACT INITIATIVE
BLUE RIBBON TASK FORCE
OCTOBER 23-24, 2004 MEETING SUMMARY
Central Valley Auditorium, Cal/EPA Building
1001 I Street
Sacramento, California
December 23, 2004**

Note: Audio and video recordings of the October 23-24 meeting are available on the Internet at <http://www.dfg.ca.gov/mrd/mlpa/meetings.html>. Please contact Melissa Miller-Henson for information about obtaining DVD copies of these recordings.

Saturday, October 23, 2004

Attending:

Phil Isenberg (Chair)
Bill Anderson
Meg Caldwell
Ann D'Amato
Susan Golding
Dr. Jane Pisano

Absent:

Dr. Fernando Guerra
Catherine Reheis-Boyd
Doug Wheeler

Introduction and Welcome

Phil Isenberg, Chair, MLPA Blue Ribbon Task Force

Members of the Blue Ribbon Task Force (BRTF) introduced themselves and welcomed the public to the first meeting. The *ad hoc* staff members were acknowledged for their efforts in organizing the meeting.

Charge to Blue Ribbon Task Force

Mike Chrisman, Secretary, California Resources Agency

The briefing documents, *California Marine Life Protection Act Initiative: Conceptual Overview and Charter of the Blue Ribbon Task Force*, were summarized.

A BRTF member expressed concern about the short timeline for deadlines. Response: professional staff will be starting soon and hopefully deadlines will not be moved. The initiative partners want to see the deadlines met.

A BRTF member asked for the decision-making process to be clarified. Response: the BRTF will make recommendations to the Department of Fish and Game, which will exercise independent judgment in determining what to submit to the Fish and Game Commission. The commission ultimately decides on the content of the Master Plan Framework.

The Mandate of the Marine Life Protection Act

Ryan Broddrick, Director, California Department of Fish and Game

Summary of main points: MPA networks will be in place statewide by 2011. The science advisory team will be appointed by mid-November. The Department of Fish and Game will seek a broad group of science advisors from across the nation. Six members of the science team will be a sub-team for the central coast. The Science Team will be more than ecological and fishery scientists: social and economic scientists will also be included. One major goal of the initiative is to obtain support from stakeholders. The task force will provide direction on how to gain public involvement.

A BRTF member asked why the MLPA was not implemented according to the timeline in statute that called for submission of the Master Plan in 2002. Response: the time and resources needed for implementation of the MLPA were greater than envisioned and lack of funding prevented the department from meeting this mandate. The initiative, with private funding and BRTF credibility, will allow the department to meet the mandate. An outreach plan is needed to engage the public and Fish and Game Commissioners.

A BRTF member asked about the broad objectives for transparency, in particular how the science advisory team will interact with the public. Response: science team meetings will be open to the public, and the written comments will be posted to the Internet. Scientists will be selected who are known for presenting in public forums.

A BRTF member asked about the end of the process—the implementation phase. Response: the BRTF will help determine what it will take to implement the Master Plan—costs etc. The central coast project will give us an idea. The BRTF's credibility will aid in securing funding, while the BRTF's mandate includes developing an overall funding strategy. The State of California is just recovering from a budget crisis and hiring freeze, and general fund money is no longer available.

Past Efforts to Implement MPAs in California's Waters

Patty Wolf, Marine Region Manager, California Department of Fish and Game

Summary of main points: before MLPA, MPAs in California were designated for a variety of reasons (e.g. Proposition 32, also known as the gill-net initiative) and in piecemeal fashion; therefore, the state's MPAs lacked coherence. After the MLPA passed, the department led two efforts to implement the act. In the first effort, a master plan team met for a year and drafted preliminary maps of proposed MPA networks; these maps were presented at public workshops along the coast. The maps were intended as starting points for discussion, but the public saw the maps as final and felt that they should have been involved in the process from the beginning. Strong public opposition at the public workshops moved the effort in a new direction. In the second effort, the department convened stakeholder meetings with seven regional groups. Constituent involvement and professional facilitation were central to this process. Then the state budget crisis caused this process to be put on hold.

Prior to that, the department partnered with the Channel Islands National Marine Sanctuary on a process to develop an MPA network around the Channel Islands. In the Channel Islands process, a marine reserves working group composed of stakeholders consulted with science and economic advisory groups. Ultimately, the consensus goal was not reached, but the working group provided solid advice to the Fish and Game Commission. MPAs were implemented in state waters at the Channel Islands in April 2003 and the federal phase is now in process.

A BRTF member asked why consensus was pursued in the Channel Islands process. Response: it was thought that a consensus product would be more broadly accepted. The BRTF should attempt to narrow differences among stakeholders and make recommendation to the Fish and Game Commission.

A BRTF member asked for clarification about state and national marine sanctuary MPA efforts. Response: staff explained jurisdictional boundaries. The state has authority in state waters (3 miles from shore) and the national marine sanctuaries do not need to adopt regulations to implement the state's MPAs. The Channel Islands National Marine Sanctuary is developing a plan for MPAs outside of state waters.

A BRTF member asked about efforts to capitalize on these existing MPA efforts like the Channel Islands. Response: preliminary discussions have begun and the Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary is interested in assisting with the MLPA process. A BRTF member recommended that this relationship be institutionalized.

A BRTF member asked for a description of Sea Grant. Response: Sea Grant is the research arm of the state. On November 18-19, 2004, in cooperation with Sea Grant, the state is holding the California Ocean and Coastal Research Needs Workshop.

A BRTF member asked about the involvement of California State Parks in MLPA. Response: MLPA requires that State Parks have a seat on the science team, and they will be involved in discussions about and designation of marine parks.

General Orientation to MPAs in California

Brian Baird, Assistant Secretary for Ocean and Coastal Policy, California Resources Agency

Please refer to briefing document *Existing State Marine Protected Areas*.

Summary of main points: previously, there was no comprehensive plan for MPAs in California—there were 18 different MPA classifications. The Marine Managed Areas Working Group recommended the consolidation of these 18 classifications into 6 categories: state marine reserve, state marine park, state marine conservation area, state marine cultural preservation area, state marine recreational management area, and state water quality protection area. The first three of these classifications are MPAs, with which the BRTF will be dealing. To clarify a frequent misinterpretation of regulations, people can enter all state MPAs

but there are different limitations on fishing and other extractive activities. There are many existing MPAs in California's waters, but they represent a small fraction of state waters. MPAs are also part of an overall fisheries management strategy along with traditional management methods like seasonal, gear, depth, and size restrictions. The MLPA will produce a coherent plan to use MPAs, in part, as a tool in our chest to manage fisheries.

A BRTF member asked whether we know the status of our fisheries. Response: the department produced *California's Living Marine Resources: A Status Report* in 2001. A BRTF member requested that staff provide the BRTF with a copy of this report.

A BRTF member asked whether there is documentation for how existing MPAs were classified. Response: the department has produced a document detailing all existing MPAs.

A BRTF member asked about the relative importance and efficacy of management tools in the chest—MPAs versus traditional fisheries management methods. Response: fisheries have declined under traditional methods. Unlike traditional methods, MPAs are long-term, more comprehensive, and move beyond single-species management. There is scientific consensus that marine reserves will have strong effects within their boundaries, but how MPAs will affect fisheries is less well known. Therefore, we need to use MPAs in concert with other fisheries management tools.

A BRTF member asked whether the MLPA focuses on more than fisheries management—ecosystem management. Response: the MLPA mandates ecosystem management. Fisheries management now does include a spatial aspect but where fisheries management and MPAs interact is not well understood.

A brief discussion took place about whether the meeting should break for lunch and reconvene early. Staff commented that maybe the BRTF should follow the agenda so that the public can watch sections they are interested in per the timeframes identified. A BRTF member recommended that the BRTF proceed despite the posted agenda times since the public can access any sections they miss in the audio or video archives.

A BRTF member asked how the BRTF will address the economic impacts of the overall master plan. Response: in the Channel Islands, there was a strong effort to include socio-economic information, though economic information on fishing was scarce and at the wrong spatial scale for MPAs. In Channel Islands, they had to conduct studies to obtain the necessary data.

Initiative Objectives, Structure and Status

Staff reviewed the briefing documents *MLPA Initiative: Conceptual Overview* and *Roles of Government and Non-government participants*.

A BRTF member asked about long-term funding for MLPA implementation outside of the central coast project area. Response: the department currently can only commit support for the

central coast project, which will start as soon as the area is identified by the BRTF. In 2006, the department will be able to commit resources outside of the central coast.

Staff reviewed the briefing document *MLPA Initiative: Charter of the Master Plan Science Advisory Team* and commented on the status of appointments and the anticipated meeting schedule.

Summary of main points: the science advisory team will consist of 15-20 biological and socio-economic scientists from different agencies and institutions around the country. Six scientists will be on a sub-team for the central coast project. They will present best available science to assist the BRTF in meeting the objectives of the initiative. Scientists will report alternative views on issues to the BRTF and try to reduce uncertainty. Earlier in the week, a letter was sent to scientists inquiring as to their interest in serving on the science team. The department director expects to make appointments by November 22 and possibly hold a first meeting on December 6. The department is receiving lots of interest—people are calling to make nominations. The criteria for selection include willingness, knowledge and recognition from peers.

A BRTF member asked whether they would be excluding some scientists that have published literature on MPAs. Response: key scientists will not be excluded based on their publications.

A BRTF member expressed concern about the science team starting on some tasks right away. Response: the benchmark will be to provide the necessary science to make policy decisions.

A BRTF member asked whether the science team will present priorities and overall analysis of the science to the BRTF, or will the BRTF have to sort through the science team's deliberations. Response: the science will be organized into priorities and presented so that the BRTF can easily understand. The MLPA requires the department to establish an external scientific peer review.

Task Force Operations ***Phil Isenberg, BRTF Chair***

- A. **TASK FORCE ACTION:** the BRTF unanimously adopted their charter, *MLPA Initiative: Charter of California MLPA Blue Ribbon Task Force*.
- B. Status of staffing. The executive director is expected to be announced in seven to ten days after the meeting and the other professional support staff will be selected shortly afterwards. The plan is for professional support to be housed at the Resources Agency.
- C. Schedule of meetings. The next meeting is scheduled for January 10-11, 2005. February 14-15, 2005 is tentatively scheduled for the following meeting.

- D. **TASK FORCE ACTION:** the BRTF adopted the *Policy for an Open and Transparent Process* with the following amendments: 1) Information is made available to the public in a timely fashion, 2) the transparency policy can be revised if necessary, and 3) the BRTF is pro-active in providing information to the public. The BRTF adopted the *Preliminary Reimbursement Rate Guidelines* for the interim. The BRTF adopted a set of *Operating Procedures*.

The BRTF requested that staff keep the members up-to-date on the number of people on the distribution list. Staff announced that there are currently around 325 people on the MLPA list server and 10-12 people are adding themselves every day.

Preliminary Initiative and Task Force Budgets

- A. **TASK FORCE ACTION:** the BRTF adopted an interim spending authority. Chair Isenberg will authorize spending for a two month period within the specified limits.
- B. **TASK FORCE ACTION:** the remainder of the fiscal year budget will be developed by staff for presentation and discussion at the January meeting.

Staff described the Resources Legacy Fund Foundation and major contributors to the MLPA Initiative. The memorandum of understanding states that BRTF "staff" will be independent consultants under contract with the Resources Legacy Fund Foundation. The anticipation is that the steering committee will identify additional consultants as needed. A BRTF member requested that the BRTF be consulted about large contracts.

Work Plan for the Draft Master Plan Framework

- A. Presentation on the programmatic requirements in MLPA. Staff presented the *Proposed Table of Contents for the Draft Master Plan Framework* to the BRTF.

A BRTF member noted that the proposed table of contents follows the statute. Staff clarified that there will be a formal review of the draft master plan framework by the Fish and Game Commission with a prescribed public comment procedure. A BRTF member volunteered to regularly report to the California Coastal Commission on the MLPA process.

The BRTF discussed the timeline for releasing and receiving public comment on the draft master plan framework. Staff noted that the timeline was developed based on a mid-December meeting but now the next meeting will be in January, so the timeline will have to be revised. A BRTF member expressed concern about the public having enough time to review the draft master plan framework and recommended that it be released as soon as possible with it clearly marked that the BRTF has not reviewed it. Some members of the BRTF expressed concern about staff's ability to release a draft master plan framework by December given that they have not been hired yet and the science team will not meet until December. A BRTF member requested that the public be notified of the compressed timeline.

- B. **TASK FORCE ACTION:** the BRTF unanimously adopted the draft *Table of Contents for Draft Master Plan Framework*.
- C. **TASK FORCE ACTION:** the BRTF unanimously adopted the *Work Plan for preparing the Draft Master Plan Framework* with adjustments to reflect changes in BRTF meetings, but maintaining the release to two draft documents, two opportunities for public comment, and the March 15 deadline.

Public Comment on Day One Topics

Note: please refer to the audio or video archive for complete comments. A brief summary of key points is provided below.

The first speaker supported the new approach and offered his assistance to the new effort. He shares the concerns of fishermen about MPAs but feels that the ocean is a public trust and the public has the right to set aside some areas. He plans to encourage participation in the process in southern California.

The chair encouraged the speaker to submit written comments.

The next speaker encouraged the BRTF to read letters submitted to the BRTF and expressed concern about BRTF members being able to get up to speed on MPA issues. Fishermen would like to help educate the BRTF—they will provide testimony and e-mails.

A BRTF member asked staff to set up a method for the public to reach the BRTF on the website.

The next speaker commented that recreational license fees have gone up but they do not know what those fees are used for. MPAs are just one tool used to manage fisheries. The speaker was concerned about the funding for this process coming from the environmental community and warns the BRTF not to rush into a decision without involving stakeholders. The speaker urged the BRTF to consider the economic impact to recreational fishers.

The chair asked the speaker to comment again during the stakeholder involvement session and to submit comments in writing.

The next speaker stated that the Mendocino regional working group has been continuing to meet on a volunteer basis and asks that the BRTF consider the work by this group. He also asked that Big Sur to Mendocino be considered as the central coast project area. A BRTF member responded that this project has to stay within boundaries currently set. The speaker encouraged the BRTF to build on past efforts but avoid their pitfalls by having strong stakeholder involvement. He also encouraged the BRTF to be involved in the sanctuary joint management plan review process.

The next speaker gave the BRTF a letter which is a unified statement from several fishing groups. He stated that these groups disagree on many things but they agree that the most serious problem is that this funding arrangement is going to predetermine the outcome. He asked the BRTF to consider serious social and economic issues from MPAs.

The next speaker stated that he supports the statement made in a letter addressed by the previous speaker. He also stated that MPAs need to be backed up by sound science.

The next speaker encouraged the BRTF to avoid the polarization of the first round and was concerned that if a draft is released without BRTF approval then they could be back to square one. The speaker recommended that staff focus on attaining public comments on the draft master plan 1) goals, 2) guidelines for sites, 3) species of interest, and 4) habitats to be represented.

The next speaker commented that a great deal of attention has been paid to fishermen but this is not just about fish—it is about ecosystems. If we do it right then all parts of the ecosystem will benefit.

The last speaker emphasized the importance of moving forward and offered assistance in the process.

A BRTF member commented that they (current BRTF members) were not part of past processes. They come with an open mind and plan to do good work. They are open to public input and need that input quickly. They will try to meet their charge and make a good recommendation.

Sunday, October 24, 2004

Attending:

Phil Isenberg (Chair)
Bill Anderson
Meg Caldwell
Ann D'Amato
Susan Golding
Dr. Jane Pisano

Absent:

Dr. Fernando Guerra
Catherine Reheis-Boyd
Doug Wheeler

Stakeholder Participation in MLPA Process

- A. Overview of opportunities for stakeholder participation (*Patty Wolf, DFG*). Staff reviewed *Formal and legal requirements of Fish and Game Commission*. A BRTF member asked that these requirements be posted on the website.
- B. Recommendations for Strategies (*Gail Bingham, RESOLVE, Inc.*). Staff reviewed the background on how a set of recommendations were developed and then presented those recommendations. Briefing documents included the *Roundtable Summary* and *Proposed Interested Public and Stakeholder Involvement Strategies*.

The BRTF discussed that the goal of this initiative is not consensus as well as the need for clear opportunities for stakeholder involvement. It was suggested that staff request stakeholders to annotate the table of contents with questions and issues.

Public Comment on Recommendations for Stakeholder and Interested Public Participation

Note: after comments are received, staff will revise the proposal for adoption at the next meeting.

The first speaker stated that it should be the burden of the public to be involved and advised the BRTF against too narrowly defining stakeholders. He concurred with some of RESOLVE's recommendations with strong exception to the supplemental recommendations, including interviews and hosted meetings. A BRTF member clarified that they do not foresee that they would host meetings but rather attend existing stakeholder meetings.

A BRTF member proposed that stakeholder be defined as anyone who cares about the resource.

The chair strongly encouraged the public to make comments and asked that written comments be submitted as soon as possible.

The next speaker stated that the Marine Life Management Act has addressed many of the concerns relevant to MLPA. He is more interested in the ultimate outcome than the process. Size and location are the big issues. He encouraged the BRTF to start in the middle to gain the support of fishermen.

The BRTF discussed how they might speak to fishermen collectively.

The next speaker stated that stakeholders need to be involved in the long term through implementation. A BRTF member again asked how to get a united front from fishermen. The speaker responded that consensus is difficult because different areas and fisheries have different viewpoints.

The BRTF asked for comments on mid- and long-term issues.

The next speaker submitted comments in writing to the BRTF. He expressed concern about the short timeline and urged the BRTF to consider the economic impact of recreational fishing. He commented that department revenue from fishing licenses should not be used in areas where recreational fishermen cannot fish. He was concerned about the funding source for the initiative. He supports the process but wants to see that it is done fairly. Recreational fishermen are working on their idea of ocean parks in which resources are used wisely without no-take reserves.

The chair encouraged stakeholders to submit a stakeholder-generated draft master plan framework.

The next speaker recommended that the BRTF move forward with RESOLVE's recommendations.

A BRTF member asked that the speaker submit written comments and clarify reasons.

The next speaker said that statements made by the U.S. Commission on Ocean Policy and on the MLPA website that the oceans are in trouble do not fit with fishermen's observations that fish are more abundant and larger under traditional management practices. He was concerned about the timeline because it looks like the process is bought and sold. He suggested that videotapes of the meeting be available for people without web access. The chair said that they will look into the cost of reproducing videotapes. The speaker suggested that working groups be held so that people can reach common goals and he suggested that BRTF meetings be held in coastal communities. The BRTF clarified that the central coast and regional meetings will be held along the coast.

The next speaker suggested that the BRTF not facilitate but encourage discussion among local user groups.

The next speaker expressed concern about the funding arrangement and ask that an MOU be signed clarifying the Resource Legacy Fund Foundation's role in the process. The speaker was more interested in stock assessments than facilitated discussions. The speaker was interested in seeing a debate of the issues. The next BRTF meeting is during a big fishing trade show. It is an organizational drain to send representatives to meetings and the speaker requested funding for their participation from the BRTF. The speaker indicated that there are many MPA process going on (e.g. national marine sanctuaries, national parks) and hopes that MLPA will bring these efforts together and also asked that issues be linked to ports.

A BRTF member asked staff to brief the BRTF on existing MPA efforts and provide a visual representation of existing regulations affecting the ocean.

The next speaker stated that getting recreational fishermen involved is difficult because they are diverse and many are not members of fishing organizations. He encouraged better outreach because many fishermen do not know about the initiative. He encouraged the BRTF to consider MPAs in the larger context, including efforts of the Pacific Fishery Management

Council and National Marine Fisheries Service. The chair noted that staff will request comments on the draft master plan framework from these organizations.

The next speaker supported the recommendations made by RESOLVE, yet also expressed concern about barriers for fishermen being involved in the process. The speaker commented that it is difficult for people to come forward and speak in a public hearing and encouraged a one-on-one dialogue between BRTF members and fishermen. He advocates that the stakeholder definition be expanded to include non-users.

The next speaker submitted written comments to the BRTF and stated that, anecdotally, scuba divers support MPAs. He has witnessed declines in fish populations and strong differences between marine reserves and fished areas. He supports the MLPA Initiative.

A BRTF member commented that about half the stakeholders are interested in the process and the other half are interested in the outcome. The member suggests that the BRTF have a simple stakeholder involvement process that maximizes public involvement.

Stakeholder presentations (speakers listed alphabetically)

Karen Garrison, Co-director, Ocean Initiative, Natural Resources Defense Council

Pete Halmay, President, Sea Urchin Harvester's Association of California and Vice Chairman, California Sea Urchin Commission

Jim Haussener, Executive Director, California Marine Affairs and Navigation Conference

Jim Martin, West Coast Regional Director, Recreational Fishing Alliance

Jesús C. Ruiz, Instructor Trainer and State Coordinator, California YMCA SCUBA Program

The first speaker stated that MPAs are not a fishery management tool but they do impact fishing by concentrating fishing effort outside reserves. Urchin fishers are working with the department to assess their fishery. He hopes that public participation and buy-in are high priorities for the initiative and encouraged the BRTF to ask: how can we make it work for you (fishermen)? The speaker thought that the response will be to design it properly. He expressed concern with development of the draft master plan framework paralleling the central coast project and also that the science team will not meet before the master plan is drafted.

The next speaker asserted that the assumption that MPAs will interact by larval dispersal is theory not fact. He reminded the BRTF that humans are part of the ecosystem.

The next speaker considers MPAs an important tool and welcomes the fresh start to the MLPA process. The speaker indicated that science supports the statement that MPAs increase diversity and the number of big, fat fish that produce exponentially more young. The oceans are a public trust that we must preserve.

A BRTF member requested staff to gather scientific studies on the impacts of MPAs on fisheries. A public member commented that the problem is scale—we do not have large enough MPAs currently in the U.S. to measure their effects. Staff noted that the department

has references to scientific articles on their website and they are planning to put together reading packets for BRTF members on different issues and aspects of MPAs.

The next speaker stated that we need to coordinate science and policy so they can fix the problems and that no-take reserves are just one element of an MPA system. The public needs to be involved at every step so that there is buy-in, and a system of MPAs should not be implemented without funding for monitoring and enforcement. The speaker was concerned that the private funding source will have influence over the process and that there is the opportunity for them to pull their money with the phased allocation of funds.

A BRTF member clarified that the BRTF chair will select professional staff, not the private funder, and that the phased funding was designed to encourage progress of the initiative; funding will continue as long as progress occurs with the process, not a specific outcome.

The next speaker was concerned that recreational scuba divers are underrepresented—clarified the difference between spear fishermen and recreational divers. He encouraged the BRTF to consider non-consumptive users and the MLPA goal of biodiversity. He warned the BRTF about the biases of scientists.

Central Coast MLPA Project Area

- A. Staff presented *Proposed criteria for considering and selecting the central coast project area*. A BRTF member recommended that these criteria be grounded in the MLPA, including biogeography, networks, and socio-political dimensions.
- B. Public comment was received on recommended criteria for considering and selecting the central coast project area.

The first speaker recommended that the selected area be big enough such that MPAs do not have to be situated at or near ports. Conflict occurred in the earlier MLPA process because MPAs were proposed in areas near ports that are the only areas available for fishing in bad weather.

The next speaker suggested that biogeography, data availability, access to ports, and habitat be considered as criteria. The speaker commented that cumulative effects of fishing near ports is greater than other areas so selecting sites near ports should not be ruled out but the focus should not be on them. He also noted that there are priority places in California outside sanctuaries so all the focus should not just be on sanctuaries.

The next speaker recommended that minimizing economic impacts to fishermen should be a high priority as stated in the MLPA, and suggested that the BRTF have a fishing liaison on the science advisory panel.

The BRTF asked for comments on boundaries for the central coastal project area. Staff commented that science team meetings will be open to the public so a liaison may not be needed.

The next speaker approved of the central coast as the first project area because there are several long-term established marine research stations. The speaker suggested that the BRTF select an area bigger than approximately 50 miles and recommends that existing MPAs be included to look at changes over time.

The next speaker asserted that MPAs are fisheries management tools despite comments made to the contrary, and asked that the BRTF consider other impacts on the marine environment like cat feces.

The next speaker asked that avoidance of historical fishing spots be considered as one criteria.

The BRTF acknowledged that certain spots are biologically important and also economically important to fishermen.

The next speaker suggested that the central coast project area start at Pacific Grove and go north because there would be lots of public involvement from Monterey to San Francisco and there are rough waters south of Monterey.

The next speaker suggested that selection of sites minimize impacts outside reserves. For example, if you close a site that is good for rockfish then there may be more bycatch at another area.

The next speaker commented that the commercial fleet is not limited by the boundaries of the project area—they can travel far.

The next speaker commented that the project area should be focused where human impacts are high.

The next speaker asked that the BRTF build on working groups' efforts and recommended that the area selected not be too large.

A BRTF member commented that a practical starting point is where previous efforts left off.

Note: staff to review comments and revise proposed criteria for adoption at next meeting.

Information required for Alternative Network Proposals

- A. Staff reviewed *Proposed outline of information required for proposals for alternative networks of MPAs.*

- B. Staff proposed that the draft outline be released for public comment and then present a revised draft for adoption at the January meeting.

Meeting Adjourns